REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-21, 23-25 are pending and under consideration.

The examiner continues the prior art rejections from the previous office action relying primarily upon U.S. Patent No 5,953,530 to Rishi et al.

Independent Claim 1, for example, recites preparing a first state vector <u>before</u> the process is put into operation and preparing a second state vector <u>after</u> the process has stopped. Applicant previously argued that Rishi et al. does not disclose these features. In response, the examiner cited column 2, line 55, through column 3, line 20 and column 13, lines 61-63. These portions of the reference indicate that the "code librte.so detects the growth or shrinkage of a stack by comparing its last known value with its current value." The examiner apparently feels that the "last know value" is a value which is not stored during the process. For example, if two processes are performed, a first value may be formed during the first process, then, a second value may be formed during a second process. The examiner apparently feels that the first value is formed before the second process is started.

Even if the examiner is correct, the claims require preparing a first state vector before the process is put into operation <u>and</u> preparing a second state vector after the processed has stopped. Even if Rishi et al. discloses that one state vector is formed outside of the process, the claims require that two state vectors be formed outside of the process. The "current value" is formed during the process. The current value does not correspond with something which is created <u>after the process has stopped</u>.

In Rishi et al. all steps are performed during the process. Rishi et al. does not disclose or suggest preparing a first thing before the process is put into operation and preparing a second thing after the process has stopped. The "last known value" of Rishi et al. cannot correspond with both of these "things."

In addition, the "things" are state vectors. The claims recite that first and second state vectors are prepared. The examiner asserts that Rishi et al. uses state vectors. However, there is no support for the examiner's argument. The word "vector" could not be found anywhere in Rishi et al. The assumptions of the examiner are not supported by the reference. The present invention uses state vectors, which make it possible to make a definite conclusion in each case as to whether the "operating means" (see claim 1) are unassignable.

2

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the claims patentably distinguish over Rishi et al. The other references cited by the examiner do not compensate for these deficiencies. Accordingly, the prior art rejections should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _Sept 22 2005_   By: _M. b. Henry_

Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501